

REMARKS

This Amendment responds to the office action mailed on December 14, 2006. Claims 1, 2, 3, 6, 8-16 and 54 are amended and claims 20-53 are cancelled.

Examiner Interview

The undersigned thanks Examiner Darno for the courtesies extended during a telephone interview on March 01, 2007. During the interview, the pending claims and cited Yang reference (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0065738) were discussed. The remarks contained herein further summarize the interview.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 101

The pending claims stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to a data structure. The patent owner disagrees for the reasons previously stated. Nonetheless, to expedite prosecution of the instant application independent claims 1 and 54 have been amended to remove reference to the data structure. The patent owner therefore requests that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101 be withdrawn.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Pending independent claims 1 and 54 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over the Yang reference in view of the Lewis reference (U.S. Pub. No. 2004/0087300). These rejections are respectfully traversed. Among other distinctions, the cited references do not include a provisioning system that receives a provisioning request message from an external system and transmits information in the provisioning request message to a service provider, as recited in claims 1 and 54.

The office action concludes that Figs. 1a and 1b of the Yang reference disclose the claimed provisioning system. In the telephone interview, Examiner Darno explained that it is his conclusion that the entire system disclosed Figs. 1a and 1b is the provisioning system. The office action then concludes that the call center, which is one component of the system shown in Figs. 1a and 1b, corresponds to the claimed service provider. This conclusion cannot be correct.

Claims 1 and 54 specifically require that the provisioning system receives a message from an external system and then transmits information from this message to the service provider. The claimed

service provider and provisioning system CANNOT therefore be the same thing, as concluded by the office action.

During the telephone interview, Examiner Darno suggested that the claims should be amended to make it clear that the provisioning system, the service provider and the external system are separate entities. The patent owner respectfully submits that this was already abundantly clear from the claims. Nonetheless, to expedite examination, the claims have been amended as suggested. The patent owner therefore requests that the rejections under 103(a) be withdrawn..

Conclusion

For at least the reasons stated above, the Applicant submits that the claims are in condition for allowance. The Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this case to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

JONES DAY

Joseph M. Sauer (Reg. No. 47,919)
Jones Day
North Point, 901 Lakeside Avenue
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
(216) 586-7506